

ROCKY FORK - BLACKLICK ACCORD

IMPLEMENTATION PANEL

MEETING MINUTES

June 15, 2017

6:00 p.m.
New Albany Village Hall
99 West Main Street, New Albany, OH

I. Call to Order

Meeting opened at approximately 6:02 pm at New Albany Village Hall with the following members present: Kimberly Burton, Dave Paul, Todd Brubaker, Jay Herskowitz, Mike Chappellear, and Ron Lachey. Kimberly Burton chaired the meeting. Staff members present were Stephen Mayer, City of New Albany and Festus Manly-Spain, City of Columbus.

II. Record of Proceedings

Mr. Herskowitz motioned to approve the minutes of February 23, 2017, seconded by Mr. Lachey. Motion passed 5-0-1 (Mr. Paul abstain).

III. Old Business

1. Z16-086: 7099 Harlem Road:

Review and action regarding a Columbus application to rezone a site generally located west of Harlem Road, north of Central College Road and immediately north of the Hellebrecker TND development.

<i>Acreage:</i>	<i>76.93 ac</i>
<i>Current Zoning:</i>	<i>R, Residential</i>
<i>RFBA District:</i>	<i>West Village Neighborhood</i>
<i>Proposed Use/Zoning:</i>	<i>R4 (detached dwelling units) and ARLD (multi-unit residential)</i>
<i>Applicant(s):</i>	<i>Ciminello's Inc c/o Laura MacGregor Comek, Esq.</i>
<i>Property Owner(s):</i>	<i>Harlem Road Real Estate LLC.</i>

Mr. Manly-Spain presented background and context on the application.

The applicant requests a review and reconsideration regarding a Columbus application to rezone a 78.05 acres to R-4 and ARLD within two subareas. The initial proposal was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Panel at the March 15th meeting. The applicant is currently in the process of rezoning the site to allow for multi-family units within sub area A and single-family condominiums within sub area B. Development Commission has reviewed the application and will condition their approval based on the recommendation of the Panel.

The site is generally situated immediately west of Harlem Road, and north of the Hellebrecker development. The future Hamilton road northern extensions will run through the site on the west side of Rocky Fork Creek.

The applicant is proposing to revise the previously reviewed and approved single-family building elevations within sub area B. The proposal includes detached single family homes (condominiums) with a maintained common area in the rear yard and side yard. The proposal also includes garden style units with a side facing garage door, protruded out towards the street. Mr. Aaron Underhill said the city is the applicant but he is here to represent the landowner and they are supportive of the rezoning.

Mr. Ciminello, applicant, presented the project. The reason for the revision is to add the courtyard style units with the protruding garages. He added that they are still committed to all the development standards previously agreed upon but they would like to add the courtyard units in areas where the homes front onto open space.

Mr. Chappellear asked if the residents will be allowed to add additional landscaping if they choose to do more than what is provided.

Mr. Ciminello answered that it would have to be approved by the Home Owners Association.

Mr. Chappellear asked who will maintain the private courtyard.

Mr. Ciminello answered that the Home Owners Association will maintain everything that's not on private property. Homeowners will maintain their property.

Mr. Brubaker asked about some units not having enough windows

Mr. Ciminello pointed to the drawing elevation that show windows and argued that the living space will have windows. The areas with no windows will be utility rooms and laundry rooms.

Mr. Chappellear asked the applicant to clarify if the previous approved applications were for condominiums.

Mr. Ciminello answered that they were condominiums. He added that they are still working to choose the builder so therefore the finished architectural appearance may be different than what is shown.

Mr. Ciminello also asked the board to for a revision to a building standard approved in the previously approved application. He would like the garages to be recessed 2 feet instead of 3 feet.

Mr. Chappellear asked how far is it from the garage door to edge of pavement.

Mr. Ciminello answered that it will be at least 24-25 ft. before you hit edge of pavement.

Ms. Burton asked if there is any particular reason for the 3 feet recess of the garages.

Staff answered that the requirement comes from the Accord recommendation.

Mr. Chappellear asked if there is enough space between units.

Mr. Ciminello answered that there is 12-15 ft. between units and should be enough space for vegetation to get sunlight and grow. He added that there will be more hardscape than greenspace between the units.

Ms. Burton added that she doesn't see the sidewalks on the site plan as she suggested in the previous application.

Mr. Ciminello added that the streets will be private and is hoping to add more sidewalks and designating some streets public.

Mr. Herskowitz asked if there will be a recreational center in the community.

Mr. Ciminello answered yes those provisions are in the text.

Mr. Brubaker asked if there are any street lighting installed in the community.

Mr. Ciminello answered yes.

Mr. Lachey asked how many units will be protruding.

Mr. Ciminello answered that there won't be many. About a fourth of all units.

Ms. Burton opened the discussion to members of the public. There being none, Mr. Paul motioned to recommend approval of a rezoning application within the Accord study area with the following four (4) conditions:

- 1) All courtyard style units (outward protruding garages) shall have front porches; and
- 2) All courtyard style units (outward protruding garages) shall have at least two windows facing the street; and
- 3) All courtyard style units (outward protruding garages) shall be limited to extend a maximum of 23' from front façade of the home; and
- 4) Applicant explore the possibility of installing sidewalks on both sides of the street.

IV. New Business

A. Application Reviews

(Review procedure: staff report; applicant presentation; panel comments; public comments)

1. 5091 & 5241 Walnut Rd:

Informal review regarding a potential Columbus application to rezone a site generally located south of Walnut Road, West of Harlem Road and immediately north of the Albany Crossing housing development.

<i>Acreage:</i>	153 ac
<i>Current Zoning:</i>	R, Residential
<i>RFBA District:</i>	West Village Neighborhood & West Village Edge
<i>Applicant(s):</i>	Ciminello's Inc c/o Laura MacGregor Comek, Esq.
<i>Property Owner(s):</i>	Harlem Road Real Estate LLC

Mr. Manly-Spain presented background and context on the application.

Mr. Ciminello explained that the site will be tied into his development to the South. He stated that the goal in the site layout is to preserve the existing trees and keep the density low as developments approach rural areas. He added that the type of development they are looking at is similar to what he is proposing to the south and will be geared to an empty nester demographic.

Mr. Ciminello continued to explain that the density is the same as what is recommended.

Mr. Lachey asked staff to clarify the densities allowed.

Staff explained that the plan gives density ranges. The applicant can be allowed to build out to the maximum allowable density if they strictly adhere to the provisions in the Accord. Staff added that it's not exactly scientific.

Mr. Ciminello added that they wanted to preserve more open space on the Village Edge portion of the site, and concentrate development away from the environmentally sensitive areas of the site.

Ms. Burton asked if there is a way to bring the community center to the south to adhere to the setback requirements.

Mr. Ciminello answered that they could look into it, but that the current plans were very conceptual at this point. They would however like to maintain a very rural look along East Walnut.

Mr. Herskowitz asked if there would be any structures associated with the community garden.

Mr. Ciminello explained that there would not.

Mike Chappelle asked if the community center would look like the Broadway Bounds dance studio.

Mr. Ciminello answered that yes it would. They also like the sales center/community center barn at the Sugar Run development and would like to emulate it.

Mr. Lachey asked if they had any plans for the 10-15 acre middle area that has not been sold, and whether they will be able to incorporate it in the future.

Mr. Ciminello answered that they had spoken to the property owner, but they would actually prefer it never be developed and remain forest. The size and topography of the area make it very difficult to develop.

Ms. Burton asked about the small sub division that stubs into their site from the west, and whether they considered connecting into that road so they could have access to Lee Road.

Mr. Ciminello answered that the road is a private road.

Mr. Chappelle asked if the planned three to four story tall apartment buildings contradicted the intent to keep a rural feel to the area.

Mr. Ciminello indicated that the apartments would be setback 250 feet from the road, and they planned on keeping the buildings at three stories.

Mr. Chappelle asked if Rec and Parks owns the property across the street from the community center

Mr. Ciminello answered that it does. The possibility exists that they could break up the long stretch of Walnut Street by creating a roundabout in that area, and aligning the community center

with a possible city community center. They are also trying to link into the city's paved trail system planned for the area.

Mr. Chappalear asked what the proposed plans were for the property to the east of the site.

Mr. Ciminello answered that they were working with the property owner on developing the site, but it was hinging on sewer service being extended to the area.

Stephen Mayer mentioned that staff was considering putting together training materials and a training session for all board members.

V. Adjournment

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:40 pm.